Case5:11-cv-00469-EJD Document52 Filed02/21/12 Page1 of 3

1	Andrew Leibnitz (State Bar No. 184723)	
2	<u>aleibnitz@fbm.com</u> FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP	
3	235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104	
	Telephone: (415) 954-4400	
4	David W. Harlan (pro hac vice)	
5	B. Scott Eidson (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Richard L. Brophy (<i>pro hac vice</i>)	
6	dharlan@armstrongteasdale.com	
7	seidson@armstrongteasdale.com rbrophy@armstrongteasdale.com	
8	ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP 7700 Forsyth Blvd. Suite 1800	
9	St. Louis, MO 63105 Telephone: (314) 621-5070	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff CAVE CONSULTING GROUP, LLC	
11	Patricia A. Welch (Cal. Bar No. 127889) welch.patricia@dorsey.com	
12	DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP 305 Lytton Avenue	
13	Palo Alto, California 94301 Telephone: (650) 857-1717	
14	, ,	
15	J. Thomas Vitt (pro hac vice) vitt.thomas@dorsey.com	
16	DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP 50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500	
17	Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498 Telephone: (612) 340-8779	
18	Attorneys for Defendant INGENIX, INC	2.
	I D WEED COLO	
19		TES DISTRICT COURT
20	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
21		
22	CAVE CONSULTING GROUP, LLC,	Case No. 5:11-cv-0469-EJD
23	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
24	VS.	ORDER REGARDING CAVE CONSULTING GROUP, LLC'S
25	INGENIX, INC.,	AMENDMENT OF ITS INITIAL INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS
26	Defendant.	
27		
28		
LLP	STIPULATION TO AMEND	

Armstrong Teasdale LLP 7700 Forsyth Blvd., Suite 180 Saint Louis, MO 63105 (314) 621-5070

Case5:11-cv-00469-EJD Document52 Filed02/21/12 Page2 of 3

1	WHEREAS Local Patent Rule 3-6 provides that a party may request leave to amend its	
2	infringement contentions upon a showing of good cause and a lack of undue prejudice to the non-	
3	moving party;	
4	WHEREAS good cause is established when the need for amendment results from, for	
5	example, the "[r]ecent discovery of nonpublic information about the Accused Instrumentality	
6	which was not discovered, despite diligent efforts, before the service of the Infringement	
7	Contentions," see Patent L.R. 3-6(c);	
8	WHEREAS, pursuant to the schedule established in this case, CCGroup served its initial	
9	infringement contentions on November 4, 2011;	
10	WHEREAS, six weeks later, on December 19, 2011, Ingenix responded to CCGroup's	
11	first set of discovery requests, producing operational manuals and other documents that describe	
12	the functionality of Ingenix's accused products in detail;	
13	WHEREAS, based on the detailed information conveyed in these operational manuals,	
14	CCGroup contends that additional claims 9, 10, and 29 of its previously-asserted '126 patent read	
15	on Ingenix's accused products, and now seeks to amend its Initial Infringement Contentions to	
16	include these additional claims;	
17	WHEREAS, Ingenix disputes the allegations of infringement, but consents to the	
18	amendment of CCGroup's infringement contentions;	
19	WHEREAS, as set forth in Local Patent Rule 3-6(c), CCGroup's recent discovery of	
20	detailed non-public information about Ingenix's accused products constitutes good cause for	
21	leave to amend its Infringement Contentions, see Patent L.R. 3-6(c); and	
22	WHEREAS, the parties are still in the early stages of claim construction and have yet to	
23	file any briefing with the Court, and the parties agree that Ingenix will not be unduly prejudiced	
24	by the requested amendment;	
25	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties hereto through their respective	
26	attorneys of record that, subject to approval by the Court, that CCGroup may amend its	
27	Infringement Contentions to add claims 9, 10, and 29 of the '126 Patent.	
28		
IID	CONTRACT A DISCOVERS A A CONTRACT AND A DISCOVERS AND A DISCOV	

Case5:11-cv-00469-EJD Document52 Filed02/21/12 Page3 of 3

1	Dated: February 16, 2011	Respectfully submitted,
2		FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP
3		By: /s/ Andrew Leibnitz
4		Andrew Leibnitz
5		ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP
_		David W. Harlan (pro hac vice)
6		B. Scott Eidson (<i>pro hac vice)</i> Richard L. Brophy (<i>pro hac vice</i>)
7		
8		Attorneys for Plaintiff CAVE CONSULTING GROUP, LLC
9		
10		DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
	1	By: /s/ J. Thomas Vitt
11		J. Thomas Vitt (pro hac vice)
12	1	Patricia A. Welch (Cal. Bar No. 127889)
13		
14	CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES	
15	Pursuant to General Order 45(X), the undersigned filer of this document certifies that	
16	concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each of the other signatories	
17		/s/ Andrew Leibnitz
18		Andrew Leibnitz
19	[PROPOSED] ORDER	
20	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORD	ERED this 21st day of February 2012
21	FURSUANT TO STIFULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED this = 1.5. day of reordary, 2012.	
22		· 0 0 0 0 0
23	HOI	N. EDWARD J. DAVILA
24	Unit	ed States District Judge
25		
26		
27		
28		